

# PROTESTANCY DESTITUTE OF Scripture-Proofs.

**A** Request was, some time ago, made to Protestants to produce, for sixteen of their positive Tenets, plain Scriptures : Scriptures, but so plain to Us, for their Doctrines, as they require to be yielded them by the Catholic Church for Her's.

An Answer was return'd disclaiming some (how consistently with their imposed Doctrines will be examined in due place), and evading other of the Propositions ; alledging also Scriptures so perversely for such as are own'd ; that the Requester concluded the Pamphlet unworthy a public or special notice, and expected, if not more pertinent, yet at least more plausible Replies to follow ; except Protestants (who have hitherto boasted that Scripture is the Rule of their Faith) meant their Profession should be exposed by silence or a silly Defence, and, for the future, esteemed destitute of any Divine Evidence.

But, since the Requester hears no better of the Matter, and to prevent an Imagination that he acquiesces in the Answer as satisfactory, He thinks it expedient to draw up a brief Remark upon it.

Those of the Thirty nine Articles, which are opposed to Catholic Religion, contain Affirmative Propositions ; or may be resolved into equivalent Affirmatives ; whereupon, the Pretence of Negative Articles is a Subterfuge

to escap. proving their Tenets: But, if it were true, that their Faith (contradictory to ours) were concerning Negatives only; yet this Plea seems insufficient to exempt Protestants from that Duty; because, tho for a Negative, or every Non-Assent, or Suspence of Assent, a Reason may not be given or required; yet, for Belief (a deliberate Act of the Mind), for a solemn Profession, Subscription, and Swearing of that Belief (whether it be of Negatives or Affirmatives) a Reason may be assign'd and required: Unless Belief may be without ground and motive; unless Subscriptions and Oaths may be exacted of such as have neither Why nor Wherefore (besides Authority) for their compliance (which Protestants explode as blind Obedience); or, unless that no Man be obliged to render a Reason of the Faith that is in him, if he can convert his Opinions into equivalent Negatives: As what Doctrine may not? But does the Artifice of Negative Articles affect the Request proposing Affirmatives only? If Protestants could prove their Doctrines, this fencing and tergiversation about Negative Articles would not be employ'd, nor could They be kept from divulging their Plea.

As trifling and defective is the Answerer's Definition of the Protestants Belief of Negatives: for they believe (if their Faith may be Collected from the Thirty nine Articles) not only that the opposite Affirmatives are not in Scripture (for they may not be there and yet be true), but also that they are \* rather, and 22. 24. 28. plainly, repugnant to Scripture, and the Teachers of them arrogant, impious, &c. (which if they be, they are false and Anti-christian). Now to characterize Doctrines so ignominiously, and, when importuned to prove the slander by Scripture, to shift off the Charge by laying Their belief of Negatives is only believing such a Doctrine is not in Scripture, will not serve our turn, that expect satisfaction by their, either proving themselves no Calumniators, or retracting their Calumnies.

Having said this to New Protestants obliged to give Scripture Reasons, for their Belief of Negatives, had the Requester demanded them : We pass to examine the Answers to the Propositions, where we shall find no Scriptures produced for some of them ; and for the Rest, none that conclude and prove that for which they are quoted. The Propositions, that Protestants should prove by Scripture, are

**I. Scripture is clear, in all Necessaries, to every sober Enquirer.**

Ps. 119. 105. and 1. (it should be 2. Y Tim. 3. 15. are brought to justify this Tenet ; but had these Texts been truly quoted, they do not reach the Proposition to be proved : for, if the *Word of God were a Light to the Prophet David's feet* ? If all Scripture be given that the *Man of God may be perfect* ; yet a perspicuity of Scripture, in all necessities, to every sober Enquirer, cannot be deduced thence ; except every sober Enquirer be a *Prophet*, or a *Man of God*, or, at least, *subject to such* : But this Notion of sober Enquiry involves the Catholic Doctrine of Submission of Judgment to Church Guides, which would have prevented, and quite overthrows all Protestantism. And sure this Author intends not by sober Enquiry what spoils his Profession.

**II. The Secular Prince hath all Spiritual Jurisdiction and Authority immediately from and under God.**

The Answerer behaves himself as if He were in apprehensions, and durst neither own nor reject this Tenet. The Reasons are obvious : Yet, at length, He inclines towards it, and thinks, Rom. 13. 1. proves it. Indeed, that Scripture either sounds too much, or signifies nothing at all, to his purpose. If it proves what He thinks, it proves more

than He grants. It proves ministering the Word and Sacraments to belong to the higher Powers. It leaves this Author's Church no Rights independent, no Jurisdiction inherent, no Power inalienable, unless ministering the Word and Sacraments be not a Soul-affair, be no act of <sup>Page 18.</sup> Power; in short, it will invest every Prince with Spiritual Jurisdiction properly so call'd; tho this Author says, the Head of his Church has it not. OTB 97.3

### III. *Justification by Faith alone (viz. a Persuasion that we are justified) is a wholesome Doctrine.*

The Answerer says, his Church does not teach this Tenet, and we know some of his Communion have condemned it. What then? Are we any more bound to conclude thence, his Church does not teach it, than Protestants are, from the Decrees of our General Councils, and our constant Profession, against a Doctrine, they impute to us and to the Catholic Church, that we and the Catholic Church hold not as they accuse us, and Her to do? Besides, we must suppose His Church to teach now as She was taught, and did teach, in Edward the Sixths time, when the Articles were devised by Cranmer: But that Worthy and his Complices were constant Disciples of Luther, in *Crede fortiter, &c.* Tho in Consubstantiation they deserted Him. Again, not only the *Antinomians* plead the Doctrine of the Eleventh Article as the Parent of their Irreligion, but the strictest Adherers to the Primitive Reformers in Doctrine (the Puritans) assert this Solifidian Parenthesis as the genuine and literal Sense of Justification by Faith alone, and of the Eleventh Article. The very same Doctrine was the first new Light bestow'd on the Apostle of the Reformation by the Prince of Darkness. But this Author might have given us a Text asserting what He confesses his Church to teach; viz. that Justification by Earth only is a most wholesome Doctrine and very full of comfort;

comfort ; which intimates no necessity of Repentance to Justification, none of the Sacraments, &c.

*IV. The Substance of Bread and Wine remains after, what it was before, Sacerdotal Consecration.*

*This is my Body,* is an express proof (or the Answerer brings no Scripture proof), That the Substance of Bread and Wine remains after, &c. But, literally understood, this Text is express that the Substance of Bread, &c. does not remain at all after Consecration : For the Eucharist is Christ's Body and Blood ; which, if substantially Bread and Wine, it cannot really be. A change, less than that of the substance of the Elements, is insufficient to render them really and truly, what the Text says they are, after Consecration.

*V. Our Lord's Presence in the Eucharist is merely gracious and influential, and, if more, only to the Faithful.*

If He learn'd from his Church what he Writes, then this Tenet is Her's : For, does not this Answerer assert our Lord's Eucharistical Presence not to be substantial ; therefore (unless entirely absent) our Lord must be present in the Eucharist by Grace and Influence only ? What is there, besides Substance and Efficacy, belonging to our Saviour's Body and Blood ? No Colour of Scripture is produced for this Zuinglian Proposition.

*VI. Adoration of the Eucharist (i. e. of our Saviour under the Species of Bread and Wine) is Idolatry.*

This blasphemous Tenet is taught by the Answerer's Church ; for, did not the Majority of it's pretended Bishops vote for the Test ? Do not all of them take it ? Is not that Test a Canon of their General Council, The Parliament ?

liament? But this Test declares our Adoration of the Eucharist ( which is the Adoration of nothing but Jesus Christ) to be Idolatry. Not one jot of Scripture does this Author produce in defence of this their Test and Doctrine.

*VII. All Christians, whenever they Communicate, are obliged to receive in both Kinds.*

Nor for this point can a Scripture Command be discovered in the Answer; tho the Thirtieth Article affirms, that both parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be ministred to all Christian Men alike.

*VIII. Chastity, deliberately vow'd, may be inoffensively violated.*

This Proposition is a Doctrine of the Answerer's Church, except His be not the same Church with Edward the Sixths, or the Thirty Second Article have now another sense than when composed by Cranmer: For all Bishops and Priests then in the Western Church had deliberately vow'd Chastity, and the Article says 'tis lawful for them to Marry, which certainly violates their Vow. No Scripture is alledged justifying a Tenet so impure, so perfidious.

*IX. All Christian Excellencies are Commanded.*

*Phil. 4. 8.* Is quoted as comprehending all Christian Excellencies: If it do so; yet, unless, besides comprehending, it command them, that Scripture will not prove the Tenet. Nor can the Answerer conclude from the Mode of it's expression, that It does command them; because 'tis common to an Exhortation as well as Precept, as Protestants must confess, who affirm *Pasce Oves* to be One: The

The same Answer will serve for *Be ye perfect*: And, for *to whom much is given, of them, much shall be required* This imports, that proportion (not equality) must be in our Accounts to our Abilities. But how does this Scripture accord with this Author's Doctrine, that we must always reckon the Heights and perfections of Vertues are commanded? The Account corresponds to our Abilities (so sure does the Command) but all Abilities are not the same in all; how then can God's Commands be so to all, as they are, if He always enjoyns the Heights and perfections of Vertues; unless perfections and Heights may have degrees, which also makes little for this Author. If, to supererogate did signifie (with Catholics) to profit God; then the Fourteenth Article (condemning the Teachers of Works of Supererogation, of Arrogance and Impiety) had been solidly founded on *when you have done all that are commanded to you, say, we are unprofitable Servants.* But we meaning no such thing, the Article perverts Scripture.

#### X. Every Soul, as soon as expired, is convey'd to Heaven or Hell.

The Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, and St. Paul's desire to be dissolv'd, &c. Our Author says, loek fairly towards this Tenet: So they do, if three Souls be All; or All Souls expire in either *Dive's* fitness for Hell, or *Lazarus's* and St. Paul's for Heaven.

#### XI. Desiring the Intercessions of the Blessed, is more Superstitious, and Derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorialship, than intreating the Prayers of Holy Men Militant.

It is not at all in Scripture that our Saviour is our only Media-

Mediator of Intercession ; therefore this Proposition is not plain there. If such an only Mediatorship of Intercession be plain in Scripture, it had been easie and kind to have named such a plain Scripture. Yet none is brought, unless the Answerer meant, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, &c.* for such a one. Truly, I see not, how he can deduce from it any thing to his purpose, till it appear that all Prayer is divine Worship, Or, that we pray to Saints just as we do to God.

*XII. Honouring the Cross, the Reliques and Representations of our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of Reverence as we do the Gospels (commonly kiss'd and sworn by), Altar, and other Utensils, is Idolatry.*

Our General Councils tell Protestants we pay no other Honour to any Creature ; their Test and Homily call the Honour, we pay to sacred Persons and Things, Idolatry. We must then either challenge Protestants to prove this Proposition, or conclude them Calumniators. We know what we profess and practise to be as the Catholic Church teaches : We hear our Doctrine and Practice confidently said, and solemnly subscribed, to be Idolatry : Sure then we may conclude that Protestants believe the Proposition, and decent it is they give a Reason of a Faith so injurious to the Catholic Church, or henceforward renounce it.

*XIII. The Pope is Antichrist.*

Do only some Protestants and no Homily / subscribed as containing a Godly and Wholesome Doctrine, necessary for these times, Article the Fifty Fifth) affirm the Pope to be Antichrist ? Yet we meet with no Scripture brought to prove this Godly, Necessary Doctrine.

XIV. Every Prayer, used in Divine Offices, must be in Language Vulgar, and intelligible to every Auditor.

¶ Cor. 14. is pretended to prove this Tenet; when as the Apostle's mind is; that whosoever had the Gift of a Tongue, strange to all the Auditory, should forbear to dictate therein Extempore Sermons, Prayers, &c. containing Matter, as well as the Tongue, inspired into the Speaker: I say, this Gift (of no use, but used for ostentation, in such a Case) was to be reserved till either the Speaker or some Auditor could and did interpret, that the rest might edifie. Now will it follow from hence, that all the settled Forms of Divine Offices (to many of which there is no necessity that all specially joyn and intend) be in the vulgar or intelligible to every Auditor? It is enough (to comply with the Apostles Doctrine), that all new, Extempore Prayers, and instructive or exhortatory Discourses (by actions, ceremonies or circumstances, or other way not interpretable) be, as they are, in the vulgar: But for the fixt Forms of Divine Offices, that they be in a Language the most certain and the most intelligible, not only in Christendom but in every Auditory. Intelligible, I say, where needful, to every one by either Actions, Ceremonies, and Circumstances, or by Custom, affinity with the Vulgar, or Books interpreting, and containing Prayers correspondent to every part wherein the Auditory is concerned.

XV. A Company of Christians, voluntarily separating from all other Christian Societies, condemning their Doctrines and Rites, destitute also of any visible Correspondence with them in the Eucharist, in any Religious Assemblies or Solemn Devotions, can, notwithstanding this perverse, entire, and manifest separation be a Mystical Mem-

her of Christ, in Catholic Unity, and a Charitable part of the Catholic Church.

This Proposition relates to Matter of Fact of the highest Moment, which we affirm Protestants to have done; and desire them to make out by Scripture the lawfulness of it, and its consistency with Catholic Unity and Charity. If 2 Cor. 6. 17. *Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you,* be intended for a proof of it; then it must import that it is the Duty of one Christian, or a Party pretending to be a National Church, to come out of the Catholic Church, and be separate from Her, as from an Unclean Thing, that God may receive them. Less than this will not reach the Protestant Cause, and so much as this, will by no means agree with One, Holy Church, wherein alone the Communion of Saints, Remission of Sins and Life Everlasting are to be found. Yet a properer Text this Author does not alledge to Patronize his Schism.

XVI. *The whole Clergy of the Catholic Church may Apostatize from fundamental Truth and Holiness; whilst part of a National Laity may preserve both, discover the Clergie's Defection, and depriving them, heap to Them selves Teachers of their own Sending and Instruction.*

This Apostacy (at the least) is taught in the Nineteenth and Twenty First Articles and Homily against the Peril of Idolatry. And, Lay-supremacy (recognized to be in Queen Elizabeth by the Laity only) gave Prelatic Ministers all the Mission and Instructions they have. Now we desire to see proved by Scripture, that such Apostacy should ever befall God's Church and Clergy, and that the Laity have such Authority to deprive and create Clergy men, to teach and send them. The Answerer is mure

as to Proofs, and manifests himself, either meanly versed in the Story of his Party, or no Friend to Ingenuity and Truth: For, He confidently says, all the World knows it to be false, That only a Major Vote of a Parliament of Lay-men in *England* condemned and rejected the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*. Yet this is certainly true and attested by Protestant Historians and Records, which assure us that all the Bishops and the whole Convocation declared against Lay-supremacy and other Protestant Points and for Non-compliance therewith, were almost all deprived: The Queen and Her Lay-Parliament enacting Supremacy, whereby she imposed new Doctrines, displaced the Catholic Clergy and created Prelatic Ministers: This then is the true State of Prelatic Protestantcy, and one would think being a change concerning Religion should have some Scripture, or because extraordinary should have Miracles, to countenance it: But just so much of the One as of the Other appears in it's behalf. And this is enough to manifest how destitute of Scripture-Warrant Protestant Opinions and Practices are, and that the Request is not answered.

F I N I S.

London, Printed by Henry Hills, Printer to the King's  
Most Excellent Majesty, For his Household  
and Chappel, 1687.

E I N I S

and Chapple 1885.